REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicants have amended claims 94 and 107. No new matter enters by amendment.

Claims 94-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed. The Examiner contends that the specification only teaches SEQ ID NOs: 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 43, and fails to disclose any other nucleic acid sequences that can be cleaved with I-*Sce*I, I-*Sce*IV, I-*Sce*II, I-*Ceu*I, I-*Ppo*I, I-*Sce*III, I-*Cre*I, I-*Csm*I, I-*Pan*I, I-*Tev*I, I-*Tev*II, and I-*Tev*III. The Examiner concludes that applicants were not in possession of the claimed genus "because a description of only one member of this genus is not representative of the variants of [the] genus and is insufficient to support the claim." (Paper No. 33 at 5.)

Applicants traverse the rejection. Applicants have not simply taught single species. Rather, applicants have taught genera, for example, an I-*Sce*I site, and species within these genera, for example, SEQ ID NO: 17. In reaching the conclusion that applicants do not adequately describe the claimed genera, the Examiner has not considered the express teachings of the specification and the body of knowledge possessed by the skilled artisan at the time that the application was filed. For example, the Examiner has not considered the fact than many additional species of the claimed endonuclease sites, together with techniques for their generation, were known in the art at

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

the time that the application was filed. When these factors are taken into consideration, it is evident that applicants' teachings are sufficient to support the claimed genera.

For example, the specification teaches an 18 base pair recognition sequence for I-*Sce*I. (Specification at 18, lines 20-27.) The specification further teaches that the recognition sequence is partially degenerate, and that some base substitutions result in reduced sensitivity or complete insensitivity to the enzyme, depending upon the position and nature of the substitution. (*Id.* at 19, lines 5-9.) Applicants further provided a compilation of different changes in the recognition sequence for I-*Sce*I and the effect of these changes on enzyme activity. (*Id.* at Fig. 3) There can be no doubt that applicants' specification provides additional species of representative I-*Sce*I recognition sites.

This information is also depicted in Fig. 4 of Colleaux et al., 1988 (Exhibit 1), which is cited on page 51 of the specification. Colleaux et al. indicate that I-*Sce*I recognition sites were generated by construction of randomly mutated recognition sites and tested for enzyme cleavage. Colleaux et al at 6022, col. 2, Materials and Methods. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of additional species of I-*Sce*I recognition sites beyond the I-*Sce*I recognition site on page 18, and that these species were representative the claimed genus.

Likewise, applicants disclose other genera, for example, I-*Sce*IV, I-*Sce*II, I-*Ceu*I, I-*Ppo*I, I-*Sce*III, I-*Cre*I, I-*Csm*I, I-*Pan*I, I-*Tev*I, I-*Tev*II, and I-*Tev*III sites, and species within each of these genera, for example, SEQ ID NOs: 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 43. Applicants provide herewith Exhibits 2-11 as objective evidence that many other species within these genera beyond the specific SEQ ID NOs provided by applicants were well-known in the art, and as objective evidence that techniques for

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

screening for species with these genera were also well-known in the art at the time the application was filed.

In Sargueil et al., 1990, (Exhibit 2), which is cited on page 26 of the specification, the recognition site of I-*Sce*II was characterized. In Fig. 3, many different I-*Sce*II recognition sites are depicted. Sargueil et al. at 5663. Moreover, Sargueil et al. indicate that I-*Sce*II recognition sites were generated by degenerate oligonucleotide synthesis and tested for enzyme cleavage. *Id.* at 5660.

Similarly, in Wernette et al., 1992 (Exhibit 3), the recognition site of I-*Sce*II was characterized. In Table 1 and Fig. 3, many different I-*Sce*II recognition sites are depicted. Wernette et al. at 718. Moreover, Wernette et al. indicate that I-*Sce*II recognition sites were generated by random and site-directed mutagenesis and tested for enzyme cleavage. *Id.* at 717. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Sce*II recognition sites that were representative the claimed genus.

In Schapira et al., 1993 (Exhibit 4), the recognition site of I-*Sce*III was characterized. In Fig. 3, many different I-*Sce*III recognition sites are depicted. Schapira et al. at 3686. Moreover, Schapira et al. indicate that I-*Sce*III recognition sites were generated by random mutagenesis and tested for enzyme cleavage. *Id.* at 3684. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Sce*III recognition sites that were representative the claimed genus.

In Seraphin et al., 1992 (Exhibit 5), the recognition site of I-*Sce*IV (also known as aI5α intron-encoded endonuclease) was determined. As can be seen in Fig. 5C and as discussed on page 5, col. 2, ¶1, changes in the I-*Sce*IV recognition site are tolerated,

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

especially when they are in the third nucleotide position. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Sce*IV recognition sites that were representative the claimed genus.

In Chu et al., 1991 (Exhibit 6), which is cited on page 26 of the specification, the recognition site of I-*Tev*I was characterized. In Table 1, many different I-*Tev*I recognition sites are depicted. Chu et al. at 6867. Moreover, Chu et al. indicate that I-*Tev*I recognition sites were generated by oligonucleotide-directed mutagenesis and tested for enzyme cleavage. *Id.* at 6864-5.

Similarly, in Bryk et al., 1990, (Exhibit 7), the recognition site of I-*Tev*I was characterized. In Fig. 2, many different I- *Tev*I recognition sites are depicted. Bryk et al. at 2144. Moreover, Bryk et al. indicate that I-*Tev*I recognition sites were generated by selection of sites from a degenerate oligonucleotide pool and tested for enzyme cleavage. *Id.* at 2148-9. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Tev*I recognition sites that were representative the claimed genus.

In Bell-Pedersen et al., 1990 (Exhibit 8), which is cited on page 26 of the specification, the recognition site of I-*Tev*II was determined. As can be seen in Fig. 3, and as discussed on page 3767 col. 1, ¶1, extensive heterogeneity in the I-*Tev*II recognition site is tolerated. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Tev*II recognition sites that were representative the claimed genus.

In Marshall et al., 1992, (Exhibit 9), the recognition site of I-*Ceu*I was characterized. In Table 1 and Fig. 3, many different I-*Ceu*I recognition sites are depicted.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Marshall et al. at 6404. Moreover, Marshall et al. indicate that I-*Ceu*I recognition sites were generated by random and site-directed mutagenesis and tested for enzyme cleavage. *Id.* at 6402. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Ceu*I recognition sites that were representative the claimed genus.

In Ellison et al., 1993, (Exhibit 10), the recognition site of I-*Ppo*I was characterized. Ellison et al. indicate that I-*Ppo*I tolerates changes within its binding site, and that most oligonucleotides containing single substitutions within the recognition sequence are cleaved to the same extent as oligonucleotides containing wild-type sequences. Ellison et al. at 7536. Ellison et al. further indicate that, while several oligonucleotides containing two substituted bases resulted in severely reduced cutting by I-*Ppo*I, other doubly-substituted oligonucleotides were cleaved at levels similar to the wild-type sequence. *Id.* In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Ppo*I recognition sites that were representative of the claimed genus.

In Durrenberger et al., 1993, (Exhibit 11), the recognition site of I-*Cre*I was characterized. In Fig. 3, many different I-*Cre*I recognition sites are depicted. Durrenberger et al. at 412. Durrenberger et al. indicate that I-*Cre*I tolerates single and even multiple base changes within its recognition sequence. *Id.* at 413. In view of this information, the skilled artisan would understand that applicants had possession of species of I-*Cre*I recognition sites that were representative the claimed genus.

Furthermore, using the techniques disclosed in the above references, the skilled artisan would have been able to envision and generate many species of recognition sites,

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

which would be representative of the claimed genera, based on the recognition sites disclosed in applicants' specification and recognition sites that were known in the art. Coupled with what was well-known in the art, applicants' teachings of the claimed genera and species within each of these genera suffices to fulfill the written description requirement for the claimed invention. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 94-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly not providing enablement for any transgenic mouse or cell thereof that comprises a nucleic acid sequence other than SEQ ID NOs: 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 29, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 43 cleaved by I-*Sce*I, I-*Sce*IV, I-*Sce*II, I-*Ceu*I, I-*Ppo*I, I-*Sce*III, I-*Cre*I, I-*Csm*I, I-*Pan*I, I-*Tev*I, I-*Tev*II, or I-*Tev*III endonucleases. The Examiner bases this conclusion on a belief that that the specification fails to disclose any nucleic acid sequences other than those identified by the above sequence identification numbers.

Applicants traverse the rejection. The test of enablement is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation. *United States v. Telectronics, Inc.*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1217, 1223 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, the Examiner has not considered the express teachings of the specification and the body of knowledge possessed by the skilled artisan at the time that the application was filed. For example, the Examiner has not considered the fact than many additional species of the claimed endonuclease sites, together with techniques for their generation, were known in the art at the time that the application was filed. When these factors are

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

considered, it is apparent that the Examiner's basis for the rejection is in error, and that applicants' claims fulfill the enablement requirement of 35 U.SC. § 112, first paragraph.

As discussed above, applicants teach that the I-*Sce*I recognition sequence is partially degenerate, and that some base substitutions result in reduced sensitivity or complete insensitivity to the enzyme, depending upon the position and nature of the substitution. (Specification at 19, lines 5-9.) Applicants further provided a compilation of different changes in the recognition sequence for I-*Sce*I and the effect of these changes on enzyme activity. (*Id.* at Fig. 3) There can be no doubt that applicants' specification provides additional species of I-*Sce*I recognition sites.

Moreover, Exhibits 1-11 provide objective evidence that many other species of the claimed recognition sites, beyond the specific SEQ ID NOs provided by applicants, were well-known in the art. Exhibits 1-11 also provide objective evidence that techniques for screening for species within these genera were also well-known in the art at the time the application was filed. Accordingly, no undue experimentation would be required to practice applicants' claimed invention.

Furthermore, the Examiner's allegation that "the specification cannot be relied upon to teach how to make the variants as claimed" is in error. Applicants' specification specifically cites, and incorporates by reference, Colleaux et al., 1988 (Exhibit 1); Sargueil et al., 1990, (Exhibit 2); and Chu et al., 1991 (Exhibit 6). Each of these references discloses techniques for making the claimed variants. As a result, the specification can be relied upon to teach how to make the variants as claimed. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

The Examiner also contends that, given the broadest possible interpretation of the recitation "A transgenic mouse comprising a recombinant cell," the invention reads on a transgenic mouse comprising a recombinant cell, wherein the transgene encoded in the transgenic mouse is different from the transgene present in the recombinant cell.

Applicants traverse the rejection. In both of claims 94 and 107, the endonuclease recognition site in the transgenic mouse is the same as the endonuclease recognition site present in the recombinant cell. Moreover, applicants do not need to disclose any and all methods for making and using the claimed invention to fulfill the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. *See, e.g.*, M.P.E.P. 2164.01(b).

In addition, applicants have amended claims 94 and 107 to recite that the transgenic mouse comprises "an exogenous nucleotide sequence, wherein said exogenous nucleotide sequence comprises . . . ." Applicants point out that a transgenic mouse needs to carry exogenous DNA to be transgenic, but that DNA need not be germ line transmissible. (*See* Exhibits 1-4, submitted with applicants' May 30, 2002, Amendment.) Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 107-119 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite in the recitation "a unique location in a chromosome." Applicants have amended claim 107 to delete the recitation "a unique location in a chromosome." Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. In the event that the Examiner disagrees, he is invited to call the undersigned to discuss any outstanding issues remaining in this application in order to expedite prosecution.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: _____

Salvatore J. Arrigo
Reg. No. 46,063
Tel: 202-408-4000
Fax: 202-408-4400
E-mail: arrigos@finnegan.com

Dated: July 23, 2003

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com